

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 were previously pending in the application. Claims 13-16 are canceled; claims 1, 11, and 17 are amended; and new claims 26-27 are added herein. Assuming the entry of this amendment, claims 1-12 and 17-27 are now pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

Claims 1-10

In paragraph 1 of the final office action, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1 and 10 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 8-9, and 11 of co-pending Application No. 10/017,174 in view of Turner. In paragraph 7, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Turner.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the differences between the claimed subject matter and the cited teachings. In particular, according to currently amended claim 1, at least one input port can be programmably reconfigured to store data in different numbers of input routing queues that are associated with a single output port, such that:

- o In a first programmable configuration of the at least one input port, the at least one input port is configured to store data in a first input routing queue associated with a first output port; and
- o In a second programmable configuration of the at least one input port, the at least one input port is configured to store data in the first input routing queue associated with a second output port different from the first output port.

Furthermore, at least one output port can be programmably reconfigured to receive data from different numbers of output routing queues that are associated with a single input port, such that:

- o In a first programmable configuration of the at least one output port, the at least one output port is configured to receive data from a first output routing queue associated with a first input port; and
- o In a second programmable configuration of the at least one output port, the at least one output port is configured to receive data from the first output routing queue associated with a second input port different from the first input port.

In other words, in one configuration, a first input routing queue is associated with a first output port, while, in another configuration, that same first input routing queue is associated with a second output port different from the first output port. Similarly, in one configuration, a first output routing queue is associated with a first input port, while, in another configuration, that same first output routing queue is associated with a second input port different from the first input port.

The Applicant submits that these features patentably distinguish the invention of claim 1 over the cited teachings. In particular, Turner does not teach or even suggest an input routing queue that can be reconfigured to be associated with different output ports. Similarly, Turner does not teach or even suggest an output routing queue that can be reconfigured to be associated with different input ports. Rather, in Turner, the association between each input routing queue and an output port is fixed.

Likewise, the association between each output routing queue and an input port is fixed. In Turner, unlike in claim 1, those associations are not subject to programmable reconfiguration.

For all these reasons, the Applicant submits that currently amended claim 1 is allowable over Turner. Since claims 2-10 depend variously from claim 1, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Turner. In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that the provisional rejection of claims 1 and 10 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting has been overcome. The Applicant also submits that the rejections of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been overcome.

Claims 11-18

In paragraph 1, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 11 and 18 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 8-9, and 11 of co-pending Application No. 10/017,174. In paragraph 9, the Examiner rejected claims 11-12, 15, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner in view of Angle. In paragraph 7, the Examiner objected to claims 13-14 and 16-17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim 11 has been amended to include the features of previously pending claim 16. As such, currently amended claim 11 is equivalent to previously pending claim 16 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that currently amended claim 11 is allowable. Since claims 12 and 17-18 depend from claim 11, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable.

New Claims 26-27

New claim 26 is equivalent to previously pending claim 13 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 26 is allowable.

New claim 27 is equivalent to previously pending claim 14 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 27 is allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/7/06

Customer No. 46900

Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.

1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102


Steve Mendelsohn
Registration No. 35,951
Attorney for Applicant
(215) 557-6657 (phone)
(215) 557-8477 (fax)